

Research in Crime

CENTRE OF CRIMINOLOGY
JUN 8 1973
LIBRARY

Research in Crime



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761075965707>

TRANSITION

Address: 314 220 3rd Avenue South, Saskatoon, Sask.

Editor: Arthur Montague

Editorial Staff: Wm. L. Bell

L. Klassen

Inmates: Prince Albert
Stony Mountain
Drumheller

Cover Design: Ann Klein Nosen

TRANSITION is written and edited by inmates and ex-inmates of federal penitentiaries with ensured anonymity, if desired, and with complete editorial freedom.

All material in TRANSITION is copyrighted by its authors and is not to be reproduced in any form whatsoever without their permission.

Subscriptions are available at \$6.00 per year, single copies at 75¢ each.

TRANSITION is published monthly by the Transition Society, and printed by the Community Media Co-op.

Vol. 1 No. 4

May, 1973

.....Notes and Other Clutter

None of our contributors and workers were thrown into jail this month, and none got out either, therefore we've managed to get back into a regular publishing schedule.

The Saskatoon Council of the John Howard Society recently purchased twenty subscriptions to Transition. These subscriptions will be going to inmates. Some readers may be puzzled that with this announcement comes a fairly critical article about the John Howard's now-closed halfway house in Regina. All we can say about this is that poor efforts demand exposure and good efforts demand encouragement.

Under the second heading is included an article on the Regina-based Freedom Group. One of the pleasures of a recent visit to Regina was meeting Gerry Cole and Bill Wales, who head up the Freedom Group. Generally, there aren't many ex-cons in Saskatoon and the opportunity to rehash who's doing what where, who's in and who's out, wasn't missed. The importance of shared experience as a foundation for a cooperative working relationship was driven home by the meeting.

We've been a little overwhelmed at the number of judges who have purchased Transition subscriptions. Social worker and corrections personnel response has been disappointing, but then, for them to subscribe would be a little masochistic. For them to feel this way is as nonsensical as for them to think they can't learn anything from the mag.

Another funny thing that's been happening since Transition started is the opinion on the part of many

people that we're making money out of it. If we were they'd probably feel better. Now that I think of it, so would we. But we're not and we don't expect to. What's particularly funny is that a lot of inmates and ex-inmates think we are too. I wish one of them would show us how.

EDITORIAL

am

Anybody who gets a parole from the National Parole Service these days must be such a puritan he shouldn't have been in prison in the first place.

The parole service has begun to pressure the government for more Parole Board members and more parole supervisors; and inmates have become the pawns in the bureaucratic pressure play.

The game works this way. As a result of very little debate in the House of Commons and an abysmal lack of understanding on the part of MP's, the parole service managed to get mandatory supervision legislated into existence. This increased the number of people on parole, an increase in a faction which initially did not want or had been already denied paroles. At the same time the parole service got the go-ahead to hire more parole supervisors and increase the number of Board members. Along with this the travelling Board was instituted and criteria for parole were somewhat liberalized. Many more inmates were getting paroles. Naturally, there were numerically more violations. To be noted though, percentage-wise there was no increase in violations---this remained fairly constant.

When the travelling Boards started, they were empowered to grant paroles on-the-spot to all but those convicted of very serious offenses. The serious cases were decided in Ottawa by the full nine-member Board or at least a quorum of five members. Apparently this arrangement wasn't satisfactory; perhaps because it was working rather smoothly and there were no strains on parole service manpower, hence there was no justification for George Street demanding more workers.

This situation didn't last long. A new rule was implemented which said that any prospective parolee who had previously had a parole now had to have his application considered first by the travelling Board and then by the Ottawa board. Thus the work of the travelling Board remained as much as before but in Ottawa the workload increased. In terms of applications from federal inmates this workload probably jumped up 20% or 30% because most inmates have had previous convictions and of these there are many who previously had paroles. With excessive work for his Board members to do, George Street could now ask the government for more staff, which he did. The government said no.

This didn't phase Mr. Street one bit. He's kicked around Ottawa long enough to know where and how to apply pressure.

He tells his people to cut back on paroles. To the public he says there are too many violators. The other pole of this logic is that if there were no parolees there would be no violators and by this standard the parole service would be 100% successful. His people have cut back on paroles. Drastically, and unnecessarily.

The pressure this has generated won't burst in Mr. Street's face; it will burst in the face of the Canadian Penitentiary Service because in the period of the last 18 months every penitentiary in the

country has become seriously overcrowded.

This month Mr. Street delivered the coup de grace in his vicious game. He called off the travelling Boards and re-instituted a procedure acknowledged by parole authorities, penologists, workers and inmates throughout Canada and the United States to be impractical, unjust, and inhumane. The procedure eliminates the inmate from having even the nominal representation of his own case that came from his five- or six-minute face-to-face encounter with the travelling Board. The decision to grant or deny a parole has once again become purely administrative. If the inmate can look good on paper, and damn few can, he may get a parole. If he can't, then he loses. Period.

We have overcrowded prisons. We have inmates who've just been told they are getting supremely screwed simply because Mr. Street wants a bigger empire. We have a long hot summer approaching. And we are going to have riots in the prisons. Thank you, Mr. Street.

LOW MORALE:

Henpeckery in the Prisons

I was asked to write something about the prison staff wives who formed a group to protest peer security and other things they thought made their husbands' jobs dangerous.

I wanted to write something funny because I think it's funny. Maybe something like if the guards can't control their wives how should they be expected to be able to control us hardened criminals. But these days, if you say something bad about women you're automatically a male chauvinist pig. Whether what you say is right or wrong doesn't matter. I'll try not to write anymore male chauvinist pig stuff here.

T.J. Ellis, the penitentiary director, told the newspapers that guards should tell their wives more about the work they do so that the wives wouldn't be so ignorant. Well, I think the guards do tell their wives what they do, and I think the telling probably goes something like this:

Here: Harumph ... here I am, my dear Honeybee, home safely to the hive.

Wife: Oh joy and be praised, strong and dauntless provider, you have marched bravely through another day.

Here: Yes truly I have, and it was fraught with danger every step of the way.

Wife: You never tell me the whole truth about your work.

Here: Well my dear Honeybee, it is a burden I should not place on you. You are weak and could not bear the strain. You are gentle and sensitive and should not be forced to bear the terrible knowledge of brutality and callousness

rife inside these forbidding walls. You are pious and should not be subjected to news of heathenish practices. Mine is not a mere job of work. Mine is a mission. Mine is to protect the community ... its aged and its infants, its weak and its less fortunate, from the miscreant monsters, murderers, and muggers who would wreak wee and suffering. Oh mine is a mission! I alone stand with order, equality, and truth at my back while facing the anarchist hordes.

Wife: My protector!

Hero: No, my dear Honeybee. Do not say that; I am not a prideful man, I have no need for praise or worship. I am a humble man, a simple man, a man like all good men, a man who sees his duty and does it, a man who does not shirk his responsibilities however dangerous they may be.

Wife: Every ~~morning~~ I see you leap from the connubial bed, shout SHAZAM, don your glorious blue uniform, and briskly march to your tasks. And every night I see you come home; your head is bowed, your shoulders sag, the lustre of your uniform epaulets is dimmed, and strain has etched fine lines of worry up and down your left ear lobe. Despite all this, I can see, your dedication remains steadfast; and the kindness, benevolence, and Christian sense of justice in you, those flames which kindled my love for you still blaze in your heart.

Hero: You have chosen to love a man who would otherwise stand alone. You know I am an outcast, as are all who do society's distasteful tasks. You know this, yet you are here. Honeybee?

Wife: Yes, my bull?

Hero: Have we time for a quickie before the kids come in for supper?

I suppose some readers will be offended by that, but it has its basis in some elementary psychology.

Nobody wants to look bad in the eyes of his loved ones. He wants their love, their respect, and their sympathy. That's what families are all about. Now, if he has a lousy job, and one which most people regard as a lousy job, naturally his pride and what-not will suffer. If he didn't find some way to build up his job in the eyes of others they may think much less of him. Accenting the danger or risks of a job is one way to do it. Accenting the skills demanded by a job is another way. The guard can't do the latter, because any dummy can be a guard. So naturally he'll do the first. I don't blame him. I don't think many inmates would. We sometimes exaggerate some of our exploits for the same reason. But the wives should recognize this and use it to qualify some of the stuff they must hear.

If incidents of assaults from inmates are looked at beside industrial accident statistics, you find that guards have very few accidents, comparatively. His risks are damn slight. Now, for sure there may be more than average tension in the job, but this, I think, is more because the guards after awhile begin to believe the garbage they tell other people rather than because there is a real risk.

Inmates don't like statistics much. Probably staff wives don't either because they know that when a guard gets knifed or something he is somebody they may know personally or may even be their husband. He is a human being, not a statistic. Great. We'd be the first to agree.

What everybody forgets is that inmates are human beings too. The 83 inmates who had hell beat out of them by guards during the transfer from Kingston to Millhaven after that riot were human beings. Some of those guys are my friends. Some are married. Some have kids. They all had parents. Just like every guard and just like every guard's wife. It is not a nice thing to have hell beat out of you by a gauntlet of society's guardians while other of

society's guardians hold rifles at your head. It is not a nice thing to be tear-gassed while locked in a cell. No, it is not a nice thing to be treated like a dog when you know for a fact you're a human being. And sometimes inmates forget, just like everybody, I suppose. Is it so strange that a man treated like a dog for years on end suddenly bites? I don't think so; if only because the shock he feels at having bitten is a reminder that he is still, after all, human. There is much to be said for tighter security, not to protect the staff members but to protect inmates from the staff members.

I don't want to tar all staff with the same brush, the way all inmates are tarred. A few staff members are sadistic perverts by any standard. So are a few inmates. It is unfair to condemn all for the actions of a few. Not only that, it's stupid, and in this case, also tragic.

SASKATCHEWAN FREEDOM GROUP

Correctional Progress, Finally

The Saskatchewan Freedom Group has introduced corrections to the competitive spirit, and this may be working out for the betterment of provincial corrections, at least in the Regina area.

Financed by government grants and a fees-for-service contract with the National Parole Service, the Freedom Group is now active in the areas of employment for ex-inmates, parole supervision, community and pre-

parole report preparation, counselling for ex-inmates, and institution- and community-centered correctional programming. The Freedom Group workers are ex-inmates. Referring to financing, one Group worker said, "we personally don't touch the money but we do the work, which is the reverse of what some other agencies often do. We get nominal salaries but nobody's getting rich."

Walking into their cramped office at 1717 13th Avenue in Regina, you instantly sense earnestness, involvement, and expertise. They know what needs to be done, they know their capabilities, and within these terms of reference, they are getting some very good things together with a minimum of red tape and delay.

Prospective parolees to the Regina area, who are ready to take a fair run at getting through their parole, would be missing a fine bet if they didn't get in touch with the Freedom Group when they were putting together their parole plans. Very few people can get through a parole without help from somebody, and even for those few it would be good to know that the resource is there if they ever did need one.

Gerry Cole and Bill Wales are two of the contact people at the Freedom Group. They may not have all the answers but when you ask them the questions you won't get a wishy-washy runaround.

W A S T E:

JOHN HOWARD STYLE

When the John Howard Society's Regina halfway house or, as the society put it, residential treatment center, was closed down earlier this year because of the federal government's withdrawal of financial support, the protests of the John Howard Society and other community-spirited types were loudly critical of the government's action.

According to a detailed evaluation of the house project recently released publicly, the house should never have been opened in the first place, at least not under the guise used by the John Howard Society to con financing from the federal government. The evaluation was done by professional people who had no vested interest in whether it was a good or bad house. They were paid to do the evaluation, but this was their only connection to the John Howard Society.

According to the original application for government money, the house was supposed to be for "high risk" parolees. These would be parolees who for one reason or another were expected by corrections workers to wind up back in jail. Because nobody knows what a "high risk" is, the John Howard Society decided to create their own version. Naturally they did this in a very "scientific" way; they put together impressive tables of statistics about ex-cons into what is known in rehabilitation circles as a predictive device. The pros have been putting together these devices since the Forties when a husband and wife team named Glueck did one for juvenile delinquents. The reason why so many people have put together different ones is because nobody else's has ever worked. Anyway, to make a long story short, the John Howard Society's

device didn't work either. In fact, it was worse than most. According to it, any parolee who was single and who had one previous conviction (for anything at all) or who had a drinking problem was a "high risk".

It's interesting that when the Society went hunting money with their scientific scheme they didn't go to the National Parole Service, Department of Justice, Solicitor General, or Canadian Penitentiary Service, all of whom are old hands at juggling statistics, they went instead to the Department of National Health and Welfare, which wouldn't be expected to know much about halfway houses or statistics about ex-cons. The Health and Welfare program evaluator bought the package from John Howard Society but not before he'd ordered a change which --- and this is ironic --- removed the one feature of the research plan that could have possibly made the whole thing scientifically valid --- though only in a very limited way. The house was open for three years. During that time \$83,000 of tax-payers' money was poured into it, a waste tantamount to misappropriation if the final evaluation is to be believed.

The project's administrators came in for the most criticism from evaluators.

They were criticized for the way by which they chose residents. "Several comments were made indicating that the residence program was not adequately explained to inmates at the time of application or that they had received some misinformation about the program." The report goes on to state that final decisions on applications for residence were made by the project director, "with some consultation from the program's consultant." On the face of it, this seems reasonable. To leave inmates uninformed or misinformed is in the tradition of correctional services in Canada. To leave responsibility for important decisions in the

hands of one man without regard to his competence is in the same tradition.

If anyone said the decision-making process was undemocratic, the director could point to a Selection Committee. Unfortunately, this committee was put together in such a way that it could not make decisions. This must have been OK with the director because he was the one who'd put it together.

As for the director's consultant, who picked up \$7100 in fees over three years, he did not interview a single applicant or resident. This was by his own choice; presumably for him people begin and end in a file.

As for the project director, the report had this to say: "The project was carried out under an executive director who arrived shortly before the project was approved and who had limited experience in the field." So he didn't know much about corrections work. This is no big thing; he was working with people who did, so all he had to do was simply make sure they did their job. In other words, all he had to do was the administration work.

Well, he even managed to screw that up. Not only did he take a direct role in choosing residents and their programs, he failed for the most part to ensure that decent records of the project were kept and that decent staff were hired. This was supposed to be a research project, an experiment. This was why John Howard Society got 80-odd thousand dollars out of the federal government in the first place. How they expected to be able to evaluate their work when it was completed without a record of how it went is a question that defies answering.

Who worked in the house with residents is understandably crucial. This aspect of the project came in for criticism too. The relief supervisors, those who worked weekends or when no permanent staff was

available, were mostly former or current John Howard Society parole supervisors. The evaluators termed this "misappropriate". They were trying to be polite. What it was was ridiculous and harmful!

The report states: "the most damning comment about relief supervision was the case of one resident of three weeks standing during a period between permanent staff who broke his parole and then selected, when given a choice between going to jail and returning to the house, to go back to jail!"

Staff hiring was not a complete bust. The director lucked out occasionally and got some good people, particularly the last house supervisor. The last supervisor used personal contacts to obtain employment for some residents. The parole people weren't doing this; that is, the John Howard Society. Nor was Canada Manpower. The last supervisor also provided residents the opportunity for social activity more diversified than sitting around watching TV. "The house program is largely related to the interests and special abilities of the house supervisors and group workers rather than to the project plans. This fact plus the inability of the project director to have staff keep appropriate records, indicates to us that the project was effectively out of control of project management."

"We believe that credit for whatever benefit residents derived rightfully belongs to house staff rather than to parole supervisors or project management." And what about these parole supervisors, National Parole Service and John Howard Society personnel? The evaluators say, "The National Parole Service made no real effort to change their procedures to assist the house." Further on, they write, "from our interviews with parole supervisors, it is our conclusion that few if any went out of their way to make the project a success."

The house opened in April, 1970. It closed in early 1973. During this period it had 33 residents. 9 of these were natives or metis. 6 of the 9 stayed less than a month. The house was apparently not suited to their needs. This underscores the need for residences for natives and metis, a need very slow in being recognized by the pros.

There was considerably more in the report, none of it reflecting well on the project or its administrators.

Projects like this may make one think halfway houses, residential treatment centers, community correctional centers, after-care centers or whatever one wishes to call them are no good. This would be wrong. Such centers are valuable measures and as long as the prisons calculatedly work to dishabilitate and the communities fail to provide the means and the opportunity for re-adjustment after the prison experience, these centers should be regarded as essential. Incompetent professionals have destroyed more than one project. This was by no means the first, nor will it be the last. The concept is good, but implementation so far leaves a lot to be desired --- this should be the base conclusion for what happened in Regina. We must be sure, therefore, that when we throw out the bathwater, we don't throw out the baby too.

LIVING UNITS

Why Don't Staff Do Their Own Time

Living Unitsthese are still cells and those are still bulls.

The cells got a name change; so did the bulls. The cells are now part of a Living Unit. Should be called a Deadenning Unit. The bulls are now called Correctional Living Unit Officers. He may be worth his new title, because he gets two weeks extra training at the Penitentiary Service's Regional Staff Training College in Vancouver.

We'll soon have these Living Units in Stony Mountain. If nothing else, it'll be funny watching bulls trying to make friends with cons. Nobody will have any privacy anymore, but with ranges open every night, nobody has much now unless he happens to be an insomniac. If a con is sitting in his cell when the cells are open and everybody else is participating like crazy in some magical corrections programs like TV-gazing, the Correctional Living Unit Officer is supposed to check out this con to make sure his problems have not driven him to despair, depression, and withdrawal. He's supposed to get the con to place trust in him, talk over his problems, and solve them in a mature and open way. I saw the job description for these officers. They're supposed to send in written reports on things like these little chit-chats; probably so that three or four years later the Parole Board can ask the con if he's got over his constipation or whatever his problem happened to be.

We got a bootleg copy of a booklet put out by the Canadian Penitentiary Service called The Living Unit Programme. It has some disturbing stuff in it from the point of view of treatment of inmates.

On one page the book natters about involving the inmates in decision-making so that they have more responsibilities. A little further on, the book, referring to the inmate, says, "He can only be given obedience training while he is with us." It sounds like an advertisement for a dog kennel. Usually the rehab crowd can at least make their programmes look goed on paper, but not this time --- or maybe, as usual, inmates weren't supposed to see this gem.

Suppose it was meant just for staff members. Here is how the programme's operation is described to them: "As in military operations, an advance which is too rapid may leave flanks in a highly vulnerable position it is better to advance slowly than to be forced to withdraw, with the resulting loss of morale among both staff and inmates."

If staff members are asked to look at Living Unit Programmes as a military operation, and military operations are warfare, then how are they supposed to relate to inmates except as enemies? They don't need two more weeks training for that, most of them do it already. Or maybe staff and inmates are supposed to have some sort of common enemy, such as an evil spirit that makes criminals do all those bad nasty things. This isn't corrections, this is a new religion. I hope it doesn't get any martyrs.

The real chuckle is that the military image used to explain the Living Units is old-fashioned World War II stuff. It figures though, because probably none of them have heard of Che Guevara or the Viet Cong. You don't advance and retreat anymore. You fight where you stand and you generally fight alone. Maybe this is why staff morale is so low right now. They know inmates are used to fighting alone, and they know staff aren't. Inmates have never had a Big Brother to run to or to guide them. And staff know that the average

inmate has become too damn smart to tolerate the childish "obedience training" and "be a MAN" crap. There are more places in a human body to shove a pacifier than into a mouth, and the baby isn't necessarily the one who gets it all the time, or needs it for that matter.

UBC-Radio is not owned by Garner Ted Armstrong, and Ernie Pope truly does love mashed potatoes. This message is for Stony Mountain inmates and Summer Session students at the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg Campus.

REGINA CRIMINOLOGY CONGRESS

Prisoners' Rights & National Convict Unity

The Canadian Corrections and Criminology Congress being held next month in Regina may be important to inmates and ex-inmates for two reasons apart from the Congress having inmate and ex-inmate delegates in attendance for the first time.

Scheduled to be discussed is the subject of prisoners' rights, a matter long-neglected or ignored by corrections professionals and workers but one of growing concern among inmates.

In the last ten years prisoners' rights has become a fiery issue in the United States with respect to treatment of minority ethnic and racial groups such as blacks and chicanos. In the U.S. concern has, since the Attica and San Quentin slayings of inmates, spread to include all prisoners, whatever their ethnic or racial background. More fuel is being added to the fire by white inmates, who, emulating the Black Muslims, have been using religion as a common ground to unite themselves. In an effort to stifle this movement, many prisons are persecuting the activists in much the way they did the Muslims, and with equal lack of success.

In Canada the lead in the fight for prisoners' rights has been taken by the Natives and Metis. White inmates, much like the Canadian public, are generally passive in the face of political and bureaucratic abuses, so far. However, in many penitentiaries they are at the point of beginning to resent what the Natives by organizing have achieved for themselves. If the U.S. pattern of organization is accepted, this resentment can be regarded as the first step by white Canadian inmates, because this was what happened in the U.S. when the blacks began to move.

That prisoners' rights is on the agenda of the Congress is an indication corrections professionals have recognized before the majority of inmates that a lot of work had best soon be done in the area.

Another item on the agenda of the Congress is a series of meetings between inmate and ex-inmate delegates to discuss the possibility of forming a national body.

The Congress will be the first opportunity for representatives of inmate and ex-inmate regional and local organizations to get together formally.

A national association could serve many purposes. It could collect and distribute information across the country about the methods and activities being used by ex-inmate self-help groups, as well as keep inmates of the different institutions informed about what's happening elsewhere. For example, if an inmate wants to learn a specific trade which is unavailable at the prison he is in, the national association could tell him where it is available. Something such as this may seem relatively minor, but when an inmate is being told to train himself to change his whole life style, he should at least be given a chance to take a trade or training which interests him. Often he loses this opportunity now because the sad fact of the matter is that even the prison administrators usually don't know what's in other institutions. The same applies to post-release programs; there is no co-ordination of programs, facilities, or information.

In matters of common concern, inmates and ex-inmates would have a stronger voice if the listeners knew it had the backing of a national association. Not only that, but it has become painfully obvious that government bodies must look beyond noisy Tory backbenchers for less emotional and more realistic advice.

Regional differences and specific problems or needs mean that a national association could not expect to be the voice of inmates and ex-inmates in many things. You have only to look at Quebec's chaos and uneven treatment of poorer provinces to see that nation-wide efforts in Canada; that is, blanket efforts, must be careful in their application. If the Canadian government can't do it effectively, then inmates and ex-inmates would be wise not to try with the same approach. Local groups, therefore, should be left to make their own decisions; the national association should not and cannot direct them from day-to-day. Given the individualism and independence shown by most activists among inmates and ex-inmates, it's doubtful a national association could control everything anyway. Nobody would put up with it. Nevertheless, some kind of national representative body is essential.

REFLECTIONS ON REFORM

About a year ago, a few of us were sitting in the exercise yard in P.A. talking about all of the new prison reforms since Goyer took over. Some of them seemed good; others were lousy. The old cons among us, guys who were used to doing a lot of cell time, were not very happy about cells now being open every evening except weekends until ten o'clock. They saw this as the end of peace and quiet, and a few of them even grew nostalgic about the good old days of the silent system.

One thing that came out in the conversation that day was the opinion that the fair winds blowing then were soon going to change to foul; there was going to be a helluva public and political backlash to all of these reforms, partly because the reforms were piecemeal when they needed to be total. But change, they tell us, is slow. Only nature can change overnight, and man in society is not natural (they don't add the last bit usually).

The forecast has proved correct. The backlash has come. A few guys can understand why paroles are again almost non-existent, Temporary Leaves of Absence too scarce to be useful, and in-prison life back to the childish rigors of "tuck in your shirt, make your bed, please don't make fun of me" from staff. The expected result: prisons will start turning out neat polite thieves again, instead of shaggy-haired rude thieves. However, a lot of guys cannot understand what's been going on. All they know is that they've become a political football again, and this time they really got kicked.

One of the bunch who sat in the yard that day is on the street right now. He'd spent nearly two years working his ass off. He took a university course and finished it with a high B average. Not bad for a

high school drop-out who'd been stealing and doing time for nearly fifteen years. He did quite a few non-credit university seminars and workshops too; as well as worked closely with one of the staff who needed resource people for his own school work. The inmate took part in several group therapy and counselling programs. When Conforce began he was one of the first workers in PA. His jobs weren't much to speak of; he was a waiter in a couple of bars. But he lasted at the work; something else he'd never managed to do before. He managed to get back on speaking terms with his family too; no small thing for many cons or ex-cons. The MPS decided not to give paroles anymore. Suddenly, after all his work, the con saw his hopes crushed. He saw three to five more years of prison for sure. He saw this because of a past escape record, once his parole was officially denied he wouldn't get out to work anymore. In short, he granted himself his own parole. We don't condemn the man for endangering the Work Release program here. The program was supposed to help people anyway. But he was one of those who couldn't understand the demand to become a football.

What I was getting to was another forecast. The public and political backlash will continue for quite awhile yet. The best gauge of this is the way the capital punishment vote is going. The public appears to still want it. That it still feels this way about capital punishment indicates that they still regard their courts and prisons as places to punish rather than correct offenders. Changing this notion is essential if there is to be anything like effective correctional programs because effective correctional programs demand community participation at all levels. There is a point in our judicial system where the offender becomes the victim, a point where the public ceases to be the offended and becomes the offender. This is the point where public alarmism affects good judgment.

ANOTHER FORM OF TRANSITION

Transition's CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY AWARD this month goes to John Diefenbaker for his ability to consistently mouth off in the worst interests of his constituents and the prison industry of Prince Albert, which supports his constituents. The man who can remain true to his principles, no matter how out-dated, unworkable, and unrealistic they are, is a man worthy of our award. This is a man unlike the fine wine that turns to vinegar with age; rather, he is like shaving lotion or bay rum, not even the smell changes as it gets older and the smell is always just as foul. Most drinkers need only one taste of such stuff and they never touch it again. Only chronic alcoholics on their last legs make a habit of it. Mr. Diefenbaker is fortunate and perceptive in having found himself a riding which must be a gigantic saloon.

Mr. Diefenbaker says the penitentiary is hurting his city. Again, we must applaud his perception, and his double-think too. What a nimble-tongued debater he is! He is sensible enough never to say that the penitentiary, the two provincial jails, Saskatchewan Newstart, and the government-financed Sask. Pulpwood are the economic backbone of Prince Albert. He is pragmatic enough to know this though. He is financial wizard enough to not want the penitentiary shut down or moved. What he advocates when he says "lock 'em up and throw away the key" is a bigger penitentiary. He knows that the quickest path to closing a penitentiary is effective correctional work, and he certainly can't want that because his constituents need jobs.

There is a saying that the governed always get the government they deserve. Because Prince Albert undoubtedly deserves Mr. Diefenbaker and because Mr. Diefenbaker undoubtedly deserves Prince Albert, we think he also deserves our award.

314 AVENUE BUILDING
220 THIRD AVENUE SOUTH
SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN

Librarian,
Centre of Criminology,
University of Toronto,
607-609 Spadina Ave.,
Toronto 181, Ont.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
SASKATCHEWAN